

# SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress  
2nd Session

Vote No. 40

March 19, 1996, 3:28 p.m.  
Page S-2281 Temp. Record

## OMNIBUS APPROPRIATIONS/Strike Contingency Funding

**SUBJECT:** Balanced Budget Downpayment Act, II . . . H.R. 3019. Gramm amendment No. 3519 to the Hatfield modified substitute amendment No. 3466.

### ACTION: AMENDMENT REJECTED, 33-67

**SYNOPSIS:** As introduced, H.R. 3019, the Balanced Budget Downpayment Act, II, will make rescissions and will provide appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for the five regular appropriations bills that have not yet been signed into law (three of those bills have been vetoed, one has been stalled by a Senate Democratic filibuster on its conference report, and one has been stalled by a Senate Democratic filibuster against even beginning its consideration).

The Hatfield modified substitute amendment contains the text of S. 1594, as reported, which is the Senate's version of the bill. The amendment would increase spending by \$1.2 billion over the House-passed amount, and would create a \$4.8 billion contingency fund to accommodate part of the additional \$8 billion in spending requested by President Clinton (funds would not be released until a budget agreement between the President and Congress was enacted; President Clinton did not ask for or identify any means of paying for his increased spending proposals). As amended, the contingency fund was reduced (see vote Nos. 27 and 37).

**The Gramm amendment** would forbid obligating or expending any funds made available under title IV of this Act, which will provide appropriations for various programs contingent upon the enactment of a budget agreement between the President and the Congress.

**Those favoring** the amendment contended:

This Act contains one of the most extraordinary, and offensive, provisions that has ever been put into an appropriations bill--a multi-billion dollar spending bribe to entice the President into agreeing to restrain the entitlement spending that is threatening to bankrupt America. We understand, and sympathize, with our colleagues who have made this proposal--President Clinton has shown zero willingness to address the entitlement spending which is bankrupting our country, and he has at the same time repeatedly

(See other side)

YEAS (33)			NAYS (67)			NOT VOTING (0)	
Republicans	Democrats		Republicans	Democrats		Republicans	Democrats
(33 or 62%)	(0 or 0%)		(20 or 38%)	(47 or 100%)		(0)	(0)
Abraham	Inhofe		Bennett	Akaka	Inouye		
Ashcroft	Kempthorne		Bond	Baucus	Johnston		
Brown	Kyl		Campbell	Biden	Kennedy		
Burns	Lott		Chafee	Bingaman	Kerrey		
Coats	Mack		Cochran	Boxer	Kerry		
Coverdell	McCain		Cohen	Bradley	Kohl		
Craig	McConnell		D'Amato	Breaux	Lautenberg		
DeWine	Murkowski		Dole	Bryan	Leahy		
Faircloth	Nickles		Domenici	Bumpers	Levin		
Frist	Pressler		Gorton	Byrd	Lieberman		
Gramm	Roth		Hatch	Conrad	Mikulski		
Grams	Santorum		Hatfield	Daschle	Moseley-Braun		
Grassley	Smith		Jeffords	Dodd	Moynihan		
Gregg	Thomas		Kassebaum	Dorgan	Murray		
Helms	Thompson		Lugar	Exon	Nunn		
Hutchison	Thurmond		Shelby	Feingold	Pell		
	Warner		Simpson	Feinstein	Pryor		
			Snowe	Ford	Reid		
			Specter	Glenn	Robb		
			Stevens	Graham	Rockefeller		
				Harkin	Sarbanes		
				Heflin	Simon		
				Hollings	Wellstone		
					Wyden		
						<b>EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:</b>	
						1—Official Business	
						2—Necessarily Absent	
						3—Illness	
						4—Other	
						<b>SYMBOLS:</b>	
						AY—Announced Yea	
						AN—Announced Nay	
						PY—Paired Yea	
						PN—Paired Nay	

demanded higher levels of overall discretionary spending. Our colleagues' reasoning is that if President Clinton will not agree to restrain entitlement spending because it is the right thing to do, maybe he will agree to do it if he knows he will get more money to spend on programs that serve special interest groups that support him.

The bribe started out at \$4.8 billion, but a majority of Senators got so excited thinking about all that extra spending that they have already passed more than half of it. First, they approved \$2.7 billion on the Specter amendment, and second, they approved another part of it on the Bond/Mikulski amendment. In fairness to our colleagues, they did not exceed the spending caps that this Congress set for FY 1996 when they passed these amendments, but they certainly reduced the value of their bribe, if that bribe ever indeed had any value.

In our opinion it did not. The entitlement deal offered the President in this bill does not even demand that a balanced budget plan be agreed to. Republicans in Congress have nearly given in entirely to President Clinton's deficit-spending demands. Telling the President that if he agrees to sign anything on entitlements he will get this extra pot of money to spend will only encourage him to pursue a weak, meaningless deal on entitlements.

We think the far more preferable course would be to stay the course that Republicans have set from the beginning of this year. We should continue to pass ever more restrictive continuing resolutions until the President relents and negotiates seriously. We certainly should not follow the repugnant, and futile, path of attempting to bribe the President into behaving responsibly. We therefore strongly urge the adoption of the Gramm amendment.

**Those opposing** the amendment contended:

We do not dispute that the contingency funding in this bill is designed to gain leverage with the White House. Speaker Gingrich and Majority Leader Dole, knowing of the President's strong desire to spend more money, told him that if he would come to agreement on balancing the budget by 2002 they would consider increasing domestic discretionary spending by \$10 billion. Due to that proposal, the Administration sent Congress a request for \$8 billion in additional spending on this bill, contingent upon the enactment of a budget agreement. The appropriators have reviewed that request, and have agreed to accept \$4.8 billion of it as contingent appropriations. They have done so in order to help the Republican leadership in its negotiations with the White House. This money will only be provided if an agreement is reached. Perhaps it is offensive to promise additional deficit spending in order to gain restraint on entitlement spending, but it is a tactic that we have some hope may work, and it is a tactic that the Republican leadership supports. We therefore urge the rejection of the Gramm amendment.